DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 822 EC 142 774

AUTHOR Mba, Peter O.
TITLE The Use of Acquired Speech by Deaf Adults in Nigeria.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Psychological Society, (Jos, Nigeria, April, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Communication Skills; *Deafness; Educational Philosophy; Employment; Etiology; Foreign Countries; *Social Adjustment; *Speech Skills; Total Communication; *Vocational Adjustment

ABSTRACT

The controversy between the oral and the total communication approach to deaf education is reviewed and a study of the use of acquired speech by 71 deaf adults in Nigeria is presented. Questionnaire results are discussed in terms of demographics, cause and age at onset of deafness, use of amplification, school achievement, type of employment, communication method used on the job, likeability, attractiveness, and speech intelligibility. Results are explained to show that although many had speech instruction, the majority did not rely on speech alone in social situations. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

ED218822

THE USE OF ACQUIRED SPEECH BY DEAF ADULTS IN NIGERIA

A Survey Research Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the Psychological Society, Jos, April 1981

by

Dr. P.O. Mba
Department of Special Education
University of Ibadan.

EC142794

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peter Mba

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Speech and the Personality of the Deaf Person

I N T R O D U C T I O N

At an international seminar in Tehran, Iran in 1977, Federick Schreiber, the then Executive Secretary of the National Association of the Deaf, U.S.A. declared that:

> From the point of view of a deaf person, deaf people should be able to use whatever form of communication they wish. If they wish to sign, they should be able to sign. If they wish to speak, they should be able to speak, or they should be able to use both simultaneously, if they so desire. Lipreading and speech as you have heard, are very difficult, especially lipreading, even under the best of circumstances. Really, if in America where only 40% of what is said in English can be read on the lips, who can have a discussion when only half of the speech can be understood? Who can speak if they have nothing to say? Who can establish communication if they have no language?

Frederick Schreiber who was a profoundly deaf professional was expressing the position of deaf adults who have often been criticised for de-emphasising the role of speech in the education of the deaf. During the same seminar on the following day another distinguished educator of the deaf Dr. George Pratt, the President of the world famous Clarke School for the Deaf, which since its foundation in 1867, has been the greatest citadel of speech teaching or oral education of the deaf generally, commented on Schreiber's address and said:

> "I know that total communication is a new method that is very "in" all over the world, and the interest you have in that is all well and good. However, do not forget that speech and pronunciation are more important than anything else. I would like to say: don't forget speech, and first try to achieve speech, then other systems."

These two points of view characterize the seemingly endless debate that has gone on since the time of Charles Michael Abbe de l'Epee of France, the Father of the Manual Method; and his antagonist Samuel Heinicke of Germany, the Father of the Oral Method.

Over the years proponents of speech teaching and their opponents have ranged themselves on either sides of the communication gulf while the deaf themselves have been allowed little say in the controversy. Most educators of the deaf, past and present, have held to

the belief that the solution to the problem of the deaf lies in overcoming of the obstacles to communication. This, they maintain, would reduce their maladjustment, and promote their intellectual and social development, It would also facilitate their rehabilitation. The supporters of speech learning and the oral method of teaching the deaf believe that the best way of overcoming the communication barrier is to regard the teaching of speech and speech-reading as the most important factor in education of the deaf. The Ewings clearly exemplified this group when they wrote:

> "Like other human beings, deaf children have an innate need and craving to share their lives and thoughts and feelings with their families and playmates . . . . . The conception of speech for the deaf child as primarily a form of mental growth, is surely the most fundamental contribution to his needs made by the twentieth century. It is a blossoming for which his mind as well as his body is innately prepared."

Quite frequently the crusaders for speech have tended to confuse "speech" with "language" and have used these two terms interchangeably. The manualists, however, have always advocated language (and not speech) as the greatest need of the deaf person. In order to avoid possible doubts, they have insisted that language may be used verbally (as in speech) and non-verbally (as in signs, finger-spelling, writing and even gestures). They have stressed that the deaf individual who has a good command of language can live successfully in a hearing world, despite the fact that he could not acquire speech and could neither use it nor understand it by lipreading those who use it.

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the use of speech by adolescent and adult deaf in Nigeria, some of whom acquired speech artificially while in school. Specifically, the study set out to:

(a) ascertain how deaf workers communicate with their employers and hearing co-workers.

(b) determine if the use of speech in communication has enhanced the sociability and, hence, personality of the deaf adults in their environments, as judged by their greater facility in making friends, compared with those deaf adults who have no speech.

Put in the form of a hypothesis, this study tested the hypothesis that the deaf youth who acquired speech at school by the various methods of speech instruction used by the speech teacher will use speech more as a means of communication with people in his work place and his environment generally, than his fellow deaf person who could not learn speech, or who did not learn speech.

Rationale for the Study

Most teachers of speech to deaf children, supporters of the oral method of educating the deaf, and the generality of the public have always insisted that deaf children - regardless of the degree, or time of their deafness - must learn speech because they live in the one world with the hearing, where speech is the primary mode of communication. In an introduction to a book: Speech and the Deaf Child Dr. Leo Conner, one of the strongest advocates of the oral method, noted that:

> "Understandable and effective speech stands out as the greatest achievement that a deaf person can reach because it is so difficult. It represents the giving back to the deaf person one of the two most valuable skills which he has lost. The other is the use of hearing. However, both of these vital activities are but the means to the end of restoring the deaf individual to his highest level of achievement in the world in which we all live."[4]

It is obvious that many advocate of speech for deaf children (even here in Nigeria) believe strongly that the deaf lad who learnt speech at school would use it in social situations after leaving school, and by so doing, make more friends than his fellow deaf p person who did not learn speech. This belief has provided justification for the disproportionate amount of time spent on speech drills in oral schools, at the sacrifice of such other subjects as number work, reading or even language instruction. The rationale for this study, therefore, is that such expenditure of time on speech training would be unjustified if the deaf person, regardless of whether he learnt speech at school and could use it, resorted to manual communication or the use of pad and pencil to express himself at his place of work or in other social situations. In other words

the study will help planners of deaf school curriculum to be more judicious in apportioning time for speech drills.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The history of teaching speech to the deaf dates back to the sixteenth century although there is some account of an earlier attempt at educating the deaf by an Archbishop John. Pedro Ponce de Leon as early as 1575 taught deaf boys and girls to talk, read and write. Other oral teachers in these early days included Wallis, Holder, Amman, and Bonet. Ponce de Leon's method is described as consisting in teaching the deaf first to write, pointing out the objects corresponding with the written characters." Amman used a mirror while Bonet used an artificial leather tongue in classifying kinds of consonants. Schools for the deaf were established in England, France and Germany in eighteenth century. Charles Abbe de l'Epee is credited with establishing the first public school for the deaf in France where speech was taught in conjunction with writing and gestures. However, he later resorted to signs, entirely. Among other teachers of speech to the deaf at this time may be noted Samuel Heinicke in Germany, Pereira in France, Henry Baker in England, Thomas Braidwood in Scotland and England. By the end of the nineteenth century, a strong case was being made in Britain and the United States, for the teaching of speech to all deaf children. In America this culminated in an experiment conducted at the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, Mt Airy, to compare the oral and manual methods of teaching the deaf. The first oral school for the deaf in America was the Clarke School established in Massachusetts in 1867.

Today in nearly every school for the deaf in the U.S.A. the teaching of speech and speechreading is given the greatest importance in the primary department.

Speech and the Controversy of Methods

The hearing handicap of the deaf demands that a means other than hearing be provided for their education. Thus, the eye is the main

avenue through which the deaf acquire knowledge, and because speech is acquired largely through the auditory channel, the deaf are to a greater or lesser extent without normal speech. This situation gives rise to the need, according to the "oralists," to teach speech and speech-reading artificially to the deaf and then to employ this means of communication in instructing them in other subjects. Opposed to this philosophy are those "manualists" who advocate de-emphais on vocal speech and speech-reading as an area of the greatest importance in the education of the deaf child, and emphasis on the total development of the child by whatever means of communication that helps his understanding.

The controversy between the "oralists" and the "manualists" as proponents of these two philosophies are called, is as old as education of the deaf itself, and sometimes, as acrimonious as blood feud. S. Getz quotes H. Lane and S. Silverman as saying that:

> "The oral manual controversy is not yet settled, and there are no manual convinving scientific data on which to base an objective conclusion."[5]

From the days of the Abbe de l'Epee, Samuel Heinicke and Thomas Braidwood to the days of Edward Miner Gallaudet and Dr. Maxwell Goldstein, the oralist-manualist controversy has raged, sometimes, with unabated fury. Writing in the American Annals of the Deaf of June 1893 on what should be the aim of the education of the deaf, E.M. Gallaudet had this say:

> In choosing the means to the end, to secure the highest possible mental development to the greatest possible number, if one only of the two prominent, the manual and the oral, is to be employed to the exclusion of the other, the preference should, in my opinion, be given unhesitatingly to the manual method."[6]

In encouraging oralists to ignore criticism of the oral method, Clearance O'Connor, a staunch advocate of the oral method, said:

> Why focus on our failure? Why not fix our eyes on our successes and strive to produce more like them by enriching and expanding the very program that makes them possible - for the one who achieves notably in this regard is the most dramatic example of superior education that one can find."[7]

The supporters of manual communication - primarily the deaf themselves maintain that the sign language has a central place in their lives which speech and speech-reading cannot fill. They point to the fact that normal speech is acquired through the ear and depends on it. Artificial speech such as is taught to the deaf lacks flexibility, naturalness and vitality, and remains mechanical. The speech of the deaf, they maintain lacks the inflexion of the voice, harmony, and shades of emphasis characteristic of normal human voice. Lipreading which constitutes the receptive aspect of oral communication is criticised on the grounds that it is 'an educated guesswork' affected by such factors as nearness to the speaker, facial cue, situational cues, slow or rapid enunciation and facial illumination. The deaf hardly ever communicate in social intercourse through speech, which only a few are able to acquire with some facility. On the other hand the sign language is claimed to stimulate the mental development of the deaf. Oral work with less bright children according to them is usually not of much success to justify the time spent on it. In adult life nearly every deaf person resorts to the manual means of communication with other deaf persons, even though he may have acquired some facility in speech at school. This speech, according to the manualists cannot be named as coming first in the life of a deaf person. His preference is the sign language and fingerspelling, coupled with language facility.

The detractors of the oral method maintain further that the quality and character of speech acquired by deaf persons with ability does not make them prodicient in the use of speech. Harry Best summed up their views in these words:

> It is not to be understood that all having oral instruction become proficient in the employment of speech or have become able to speak clearly and intelligibly, and well enough for general practical use. It would be nearest the truth to say that such children are "taught articulation" or that they are instructed to a greater or less extent in the mechanics and practice of speech and speechreading.8

The advocates of speech on the other hand charge that the alternative to speech which is the sign language and manual alphabet is understood by a small minority of people only, being an imported language. The deaf who use the sign language must of necessity maintain human relationships in various ways with the majority of the population ignorant of this mode of communication. Such relationships include homelife, business association, social intercourse, and religious gatherings. Lack of speech makes the deaf a class apart and promotes the feeling of clannishness among them. It parades, as it were, the infirmity of the deaf. It gives rise to intermarriage among the deaf, thus perpetuating deafness in the society. Speech, they insist, constitutes a form of language understood by the entire population and even if the deaf are incapable of perfect speech, speech discards the appellation "dumb" formally used with them. In any case a limited ability in speech is by far better than no ability at all.

Having presented a gist of the arguments between the "oralists" and the "manualists," we may now proceed to examine the reasons adduced for/and against the teaching of speech to deaf children in order to better appreciate the role of speech in a programme for deaf children.

A few workers in the field of special education have tended to relate speech ability to the adjustment needs of the deaf. They maintain that speech is conducive to a better adjustment of the deaf than without it. Iris Booth supports this view in the following statement:

> Those of the deaf who have normal intelligence, good academic and vocational training and good speech are not so apt to be in need of adjustment. Lipreading and speech put them in such a position that when they emerge from elementary school, further academic training or job adjustment follows naturally as with the hearing child . . . Lack of speech and lipreading constitutes barrier either to securing or to holding a job under existing conditions.9

This statement was immediately contradicted by Margarette Helmle who stated:

> I have know some of the speaking deaf to lose their jobs. They had speech but they did not have other things that goes to make a good worker.[10]

Again, writing in justification of speech teaching not only as the best means of communication but as a health measure, Elsie Steinke stated:

> Speech is one of the greatest gifts of human beings . . . Irregular breathing, overmuch breathing through the mouth, clavicular, instead of diaphragmatic breathing are common to deaf people who have not had speech drill. Fundamental of speech is regular, deep and sustained breathing . . . Breathing exercise preceding speech teaching strengthens the lungs, the chest cavity and resonance room is enlarged by breathing through the nose.[11]

However, Anna Worthington feels that speech learning is so much trouble for the deaf child that he should not be forbidden to use any means of communication he is capable of. She describes the encoding difficulties encountered by the deaf child who must transmit all his message into symbols to be sent through air waves. He is unsure that he is encoding correctly. He may put his tongue in the correct position for speaking a word, close his larynx and let out air through the mouth in the correct way and still not sound the word correctly. Incorrect encoding, she maintains, leads to difficult decoding and meaningless jargon. According to this writer, other aspects of speech work that presents almost insurmountable difficulty to the deaf child are: modulation of the voice without awareness of the level of noise in the environment, discrimination among vocal sounds, and ignorance (on the part of the deaf child) of the many important cues of normal speech which aid understanding.[12]

As if they had rallied to the rescue of the deaf child from the speech difficulties just described, Richard Brill and Anne Gordon write:

> Certainly it is not right to sacrifice language, reading, social studies or anything else to speech. Speech, we must remember, is not an end in itself: The development of the child as a whole is our aim. On the other hand poor speech defeats our purpose, both educationally and psychologically.[13]

One of the most unfortunate observations of adherents of speech education for the deaf child is that which gives rise to the conclusion that ability in speech presupposes superior intelligence, and lack of this ability is an index of mental retardation. This unwarranted belief which is neither supported by any experimental research nor empirical data, underlies the reasons why the oral schools for the deaf have for long been accused of being very selective, and of "dumping" their oral failures on state residential institutions. Harriet McLaughlin writing on "The Advantages of the Oral Method" in the Volta Review of 1955 had this to say:

> Speech is not a "knack" or a talent but a skill acquired without effort if one has hearing with effort and expert guidance, if the hearing is impaired.[14]

She then quoted a comment made in a report of "The Federal Government and Higher Education of the Deaf" to drive home what she meant: " . . . .the child who without reference to his commensurate progress in speech and lipreading which is another way of saying that speech and lipreading are necessary tools for educational advancement of the deaf and that the child must make progress in his tools if he wishes to advance in school."[15]

Clarence O'Connor, another staunch supporter of speech, made this same assumption of a possible relation between speech and performance when he said:

> This priceless skill of speech when accompained by the ability to read the lips reliably, lifts an educated deaf person unto an entirely different level of performance than would be possible of attainment of a similarly well educated deaf person with very limited oral competen e.[16]

However, it was A.L.E. Crouter who "lamenting" the fate of those deaf persons who could not acquire speech, virtually hit the nail on the head. He wrote:

> The deaf man who cannot speak is not of course in the mental condition of the infant who cannot yet speak. Portions of his brain reach an advanced stage of development through the use of ideographic language, but this is at best, a onesided development, the motor areas of the brain used in speech, remaining in a dormant condition and becoming finally atrophied.[17]

No one really doubts that there is some sort of advantage inherent in speech ability. It can aid a deaf man to adjust better to the hearing world by enabling him to express more naturally his domestic and business needs and by providing him with a more convenient means of communication in his hearing environment. But as Alfred Binet observed in his investigation concerning the oral method, "the practical value of speech appears to have been greatly over-estimated," The imperfect speech acquired by the deaf neither "permits them to enter into relations with strangers," nor does it allow them to hold a smooth social intercourse with their relatives and friends."[18] In other words, the results of speech teaching do not seem to justify the large portion of school time spent on it, to the neglect of other subjects, nor the expenditure of energy, and the strain that it occasions. Even O'Connor himself was honest enough to admit that: "we all know that inspite of capable instruction, persistent effort and sheer hard work, some deaf children never acquire good speech."[19]

PROCEDURE:

This survey was undertaken to ascertain the use of acquired speech by deaf adults and adolescents who had left school and were working at the time of this study. The survey was necessary to confirm or disprove the claims frequently made by some educators of the deaf that the greatest need of the deaf person is speech, or ability to express himself in verbal language, rather than language.

A seventeen-item questionnaire was developed by the investigator and mailed to 100 adult deaf persons working in Lagos, Ibadan and Ilorin. Deaf adults, instead of deaf children were selected as the target population, because most deaf children were still in school and taking speech lessons which they could hardly be expected to judge, even if they could express opinions, On the other hand, the deaf adults were no longer under the watchful eye of the speech teacher. They were working, earning a living, and were independent of their one time teachers. Many, too, were

employed away from home and were not under the direct influence of their parents, and hearing relatives.

Subsequent to the despatch of the questionnaires the investigator met by chance, some groups of deaf adults, and encouraged them to complete and return the questionnaires. Three weeks following the mailing of the questionnaires, a total of 71 usable responses had been received. The data were classified and coded for analysis.

As the type of data collected lent itself to analysis by computing percentages, the results of this study have, accordingly, been reported in percentages and descriptive format.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study was designed to ascertain how deaf adults used speech which some of them acquired artificially at school in their daily life. The study was planned to test the hypothesis that adult deaf persons who acquired speech through speech lessons at school would be better adjusted socially than those who were unable to learn speech at school. Adjustment would be determined by the fact that these persons would be better liked by their hearing workmates and supervisors than their fellow "tongue-tied" deaf persons.

A seventeen-item questionnaire used in the survey was completed by a total of 71 adult deaf persons out of a sample of 100.

According to the results, 49 or 68.4% of the respondents were males while 22 or 31.6% were females. The age range of the respondents was between 20 and 35 years with more than 40% of the total, aged between 20 and 25 years.

TABLE 1 AGES OF THE RESPONDENTS

Number	Percentage	Age Bracket
20	27.7	15 - 20 years
29	40.3	20 - 25 "
18	25	25 - 30 "
3	4.2	30 - 35 "

TABLE II AGE AT ONSET OF DEAFNESS

Group	Number	Percentage
Born deaf	12	16.6
Deafened between birth and age 3	8	11.1
Deafened after age 3 but before age 5	5	6.9
Deafened between age 5 and 10	21	29.1
Deafened after 10 but before 15 years	14	19.4
Deafened between 15 and 20	3	4.1
Deafened between 20 and 25	2	2.7
Could not tell the time of onset	7	9.7

Table II shows the ages of the respondents at the time of onset of deafness. It is note-worthy that a total of 27.7% of the respondendents were either born deaf or lost their hearing between birth and age 3. This group represents the prelingually deaf, since they had not established speech or proficiency in oral communication before they were forced to live completely in the "Silent word." By far the largest group are those who lost their hearing before age 10. A total of 29.1 percent of the respondents belong to this group. Some in this group (especially those nearer to age 5 than 10) may not be capable of intelligible speech even though they may be supposed to have firmly established language and speech before their hearing loss. The reason is that in the absence of hearing and without the use of amplification a deaf person finds it difficult to monitor his speech. This results in wrong emphasis, stress, pitch, intonation and other characteristics of poor speech. Many deaf people at first pay little regard to how they speak or whether their speech is understood or not. But sooner or later, they become consious of the fact that their speech attracts undue attention and hence, may be unintelligible.

This realization often makes them shy away from using speech. This issue will be discussed further in the following sections. Meanwhile, it suffices to note that a total of 55.3 percent of the respondents lost their hearing between age 5 and 25, a period after a child will have established speech and language permanently.

Table III CAUSE OF DEAFNESS

Cause	No.	Percentage
Illness	47	65.2
Accident	3	4.2
Cause unknown	11	15.3
No response	10	14.0

According to Table III majority of the respondents (over 65%) become deaf as a result of illness while only 4.2% claimed that they lost their hearing following an accident. Approximately, 29% either did not know or gave no response. Most of these probably belong to the group born deaf (16.6%).

TABLE IV USE OF AMPLICATION

Use of hearing aid	No	Percentage
Always	12	16.6
Sometimes	3	4.2
Never	54	75.0

The majority of the deaf young people who took part in this survey never use a hearing aid and only 20.8% wear hearing aids of these, always. Although research has conclusively established that for deaf individuals are "stone" deaf, many deaf persons who have some recidual hearing are unable to use a hearing aid for one reason or another. Many deaf youngstors in this country claim that costs of aids are prohibitive, and one is inclined to agree with them, but is is a fact that many of our deaf students at

Gallaudet College and other institutions in the United States where hearing aids are readily obtainable, do not use them. Some claim that they are cumbersome. Other would not use them because hearing aids make them sensitive. Still others see no use for hearing aids because amplification of any kind does not help them to understand speech. These persons fail to appreciate the fact that even though a hearing aid rarely helps a deaf person (as distinct from a hard-of-hearing individual) to understand the speech of others, it helps most deaf users to belong to "the world of sounds" by enabling them to hear environmental noises. It is necessary to work out some means whereby deaf children in our Special and integrated schools are provided with hearing aids free of charge if their parents cannot afford to buy. If a deaf children has become used to a hearing aid, he rarely wants to part with it. Moreover, the longer one uses a hearing aid the better one understands speech, other things being equal.

TABLE V: LEARNT TO SPEAK IN SCHOOL

RESPONSE	NO.	PERCENTAGE
Yes	43	60.6
No	28	39.4

Table V shows that a little over 60% of the deaf young people who took part in this study had speech training at school, while less than 40% did not. It is difficult, however, to say how many of those who received speech training actually acquired speech through speech training at school. Some, especially those who were not born deaf, may have learnt speech, before they lost their hearing. Speech training at school therefore, only helped them to improve their speech and to use it with the English Language.

TABLE VI HIGHEST CLASS REACHED IN SCHOOL

Class attained	No.	Percentage
Below Primary 6	4	5.5
Passed Primary 6	15	20.8
Completed Post Primary 6 Vocational Training	25	34.7
Attended Secondary School	13	18.0

Until 1975 most deaf adolescents who completed Primary Class 6 were sent to vocational schools at Oyo, Ijebu Ode, Abeokuta, Warri, etc. They spent three years learning trades such as carpentary, welding, panel-beating, painting, sewing etc. On completing the course they were awarded trade certificates according to the level of their performance. Many of these trade schools limited participation of their deaf students to the practical aspects of the course only, owing to the communication problem. Many deaf students successfully completed the training and were employed by the government. Since 1975 quite a few of these holders of trade certificates have proceeded to colleges in America which have programmes for the hearing-impaired, to continue their vocational training or take a liberal arts course at Gallaudet College or some other colleges. Only a few completed secondary course before proceeding overseas and only three have so far undertaken courses at the University of Ibadan. These became deaf much later in life and can speak very well. Some of those who did not reach Primary 6 are employed on menial jobs or are begging alms. This is shown in Table VII below.

TABLE VII TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

Kind of Work	No.	Percentage
Clerical (Office) Work	4	5.6
Semi-skilled (vocational) employment	35	48.6
Unskilled Work	11	15.3
Unemployed	12	16.7

Many of those doing semi-skilled work are paid on Salary Level 4 or below which is the beginning level for WASC holders. Those doing unskilled work are mostly on Grade Level II. Most are in the public sector (government) few are considered good enough for employment in the private sector.

TABLE VIII METHOD OF COMMUNICATION USED WITH EMPLOYERS AND CO-WORKERS

Means of Communication	No.	%
Communicate by Speech only	20	27.8
Communicate by writing	22	30.6
Communicate by speech and writing	14	19.4
Communicate by signs and gestures	8	11.1
Communicate by speech, writing and signs	2	2.8
Communicate by writing and signs.	1	1.4

Table VIII is crucial because it permits a number of inferences to be made (1) Although more than 60% of the respodents learnt speech at school (Table V), only 27.8% used speech as their only means of communication. (2) When those who communicate by speech and writing (19.4%) and those who combine the two modes with signs, (2.8%) are added to those who use speech only, we include 50% of the respondents which is still less than 60% who claimed that they learnt speech at school. (3) If we leave out altogether, those who mentioned speech in addition to the other means of communication, we still have 43.1% who either write or use a method other then speech.

The fact that emerges from these deductions is that many deaf pupils learn speech at school but rarely use it in communication with either their employers or co-workers. How do we account for this? It may be that those who could use speech but decline to do so, are only too aware of their imperfect speech. It may also be that those who said they learnt speech at school meant that they received speech lessons (or even therapy) and not that they acquired proficiency in the use of speech.

TABLE IX LIKEABILITY BY EMPLOYERS

Attitudes towards the Deaf	No.	Percentage
Liked by their employers	52	72.2
Not liked by their employers	3	4.2
Perhaps liked by their employers	10	13.9

It is evident from Table IX that most deaf workers are liked by their employers irrespective of their deafness and method of communication with others in their work place. This means that employers do not emphasize proficiency in speech or oral communication, so long as the deaf person does his work efficiently.

TABLE X LIKEABILITY BY CO-WORKERS

Attitudes of Co-workers to the Deaf	No.	Percentage
Liked by co-workers	52	72.2
Not liked by co-workers	4	5.6
Uncertain	11	15.3

According to Table X most of the respondents, (72.2%) of them were liked by their employers and only 5.6% of them reported that they were disliked.

TABLE XI ATTRACTIVENESS

Friendship	No.	%
Have many friends	60	83.3
Have few friends	2	2.8
Uncertain	10	13.9
Your friends are deaf people	32	44.4
Your friends are hearing people	8	11.1
You have as many deaf friends as hearing.	27	37.5

As shown in Table XI, more than 83% of those who took part in this study reported that they have many friend as against 2.8% who said they have few friends. Less than 14% were uncertain. Although only 11.1% claimed that their friends were exclusively hearing persons, as against 44.4% who said they have deaf friends, a total of 48.6% had either hearing friends or as many hearing as deaf friends. Again, when this is compared with the 27.8% (Table VIII) who said that they communicate by speech only, the conclusion that the deaf person's inability to communicate in speech (or orally) has no limiting effect on the number or kind of friends he makes, is warranted. Therefore, ability to speak is hardly a condition for being sociable or liked.

TABLE XII SPEECH INTELLIGIBILITY

Intelligibility of Speech	No.	Percentage
People understand my speech	16	22.2
People do not understand my speech	18	25
Perhaps, people understand my speech	35	48.6

Traditionally, people who were born deaf or who lost their hearing in the first few years of life, acquire speech mechanically and have to spend their adolescent years and even adulthood improving their speech proficiency as regards articulation and other elements of good speech. Many deaf persons, including those who lost their hearing in adolescence complain frequently that their speech is hardly understood. The negative reinforcement they receive whenever they vocalise sooner or later forces them to give up speech entirely. As can be seen from Table XII over 22% of the deaf young people who took part in this survey claimed that people understand their speech, while 25% were convinced that their speech was not understood. More than 48% were uncertain if their speech was understood. Many in this group are probably those who claim that they learnt speech at school.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The arguments as to whether it is desirable that deaf children should be given speech therapy at school, has long been settled in favour of speech teaching. What has not been decided is whether or not the majority of deaf persons (as distinct from hard-of-hearing individuals) actually make use of the speech which they acquired rather mechanically at school in social intercourse, and whether speech ability of the deaf is a contributory factor in their social adjustment. This study was undertaken to ascertain how deaf youngsters working in Oyo, Lagos, Ogun and Kwara States use speech which they acquired at school. The study also investigated if the use of speech enhanced the social adjustment

of the deaf, as can be determined from likelibility and facility with which they make friends.

The result does not appear to support the claim that has often been made to the effect that the deaf man needs speech proficiency and ability to read speech on the lips of others to be a well-adjusted, happily employed individual. The results show that although many deaf youths had speech lessons and probably learnt to speak at school, the majority of them do not rely on speech alone in social situations. Many use pencil and pad, while others communicate by means of signs and gestures.

The findings of this study seem important in view of the fact that teaching speech to deaf children (which task is by no means easy) has been wrongly claimed to be the pivot upon which all other subjects or skills must revolve. Consequently, disproportionate amount of time has been given to speech drills (as distinct from language development) at the sacrifice of such subjects as language, manual communication and arithmetical computations.

Hopefully, speech will continue to be an important subject on the curriculum of our special schools, but the number of periods given to this subject should be reduced to three periods a week in consideration of its non-relevance to the general adjustment of the deaf in our society.

Language ability is more conducive to integration of deaf persons into the society than speech proficiency.

This study has many glaring limitations, the greatest of which is, perhaps, the small number of the sample population. Other studies seem definitely called for.

REFERENCES

1. Schreiber, F. "Extemporaneous Speech" Proceedings of the First Regional Seminar on Educational and Rehabilitation Problems in the Field of Deafness, Tehran, Iran Nov. 1977. p.87.

2. Pratt, G.T. "Extemporaneous Speech" Proceeding of the First Regional Seminar on Educational and Rehabilitation Problems in the Field of Deafness, Tehran, Iran Nov. 1977.p.111.

3. Ewing, I.R., and A.W.G. Speech and the Deaf Child Manchester, Manchester U. Press. 1953, p.48.

4. Connor, Leo "Foreword" in Connor, Leo E (ed) Speech for the Deaf Child Wash. D.C.:A.G. Bell Asso. 1971 p.ix.

5. Getz, Steven, Environment and the Deaf Child Illinois: Charles Thomas 1953 p. 48.

6. Gallaudet, E.M. "What should be the Aim of Education of the Deaf" American Annals 38, 1893, p. 206.

7. O'Connor, Clarence D. "Benefits of an oral Climate for All Deaf Children" Volta Review 59. 1957 p.59.

8. Best, Harry Deafness and the Deaf in the United States New York: Macmillan Co. 1943, p.549.

9. Booth Irisetal, "The Practical Use of Speech in Holding a job" Volta Review 42, 1940 p. 601.

10. Ibid. p. 602

11. Steinke, Elsie "Justification of Speech Teaching and Speech Reading" American Annals 1902, 47 p. 345.

12. Worthington, Anna M. "Applying Communication Theory to Education of the Deaf". American Annals, 101, 1956, p. 282.

13. Brill, Richard & Anne Gordon "The Special Speech Teacher in a School for the Deaf" Volta Review 1949, 51 p. 549.

14. McLaughling, H.F. "The Advantages of the Oral Method" Volta Review 1955, 57 p. 209.

15. Ibid. 209.

16. O'Connor, C.D. "Benefits of an Oral Climate for All Deaf Children" Volta Review 1957, 59 p. 336.

17. Crouter, A.L.E. "The Possibilities of Oral Method" American Annals 1911, 56 p. 394.

18. Binet, Alfred "An Investigation Concerning the Value of the Oral Method" American Annals 1910, 55 p.19.

19. O'Connor, C.D. (Ibid.).